



SEP 08 2001

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Patrick J. G. Stiennon
LANTHROP & CLARK
740 Regent Street, Suite 400
P.O.Box 1507
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1507

In re Application of: LAN, Xuekui, et al.	:	
U.S. Application No.: 09/763,214	:	DECISION ON RENEWED
Attorney's Docket No.: VALMET-5210	:	PETITION TO REVIVE
For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR THE	:	ABANDONED APPLICATION
HIGH SPEED APPLICATION OF	:	UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)
COATING TO A TRAVELING PAPER	:	
WEB	:	

On 11 May 2001, this Office mailed a decision dismissing without prejudice applicants' petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b). The petition was dismissed for failure to satisfy all the requirements of a grantable petition. Specifically, applicants had failed to provide adequate evidence that the delay in filing the present continuation application was unintentional.

On 18 June 2001, applicants filed the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) considered herein. This renewed petition included copies of the exhibits to the original petition (which were not present in the application file), as well as an additional statement by James Lowe (the attorney identified as being responsible for this application during the relevant time period).

These materials, however, still do not provide adequate evidence that the delay in filing the present application was unintentional. Mr. Lowe states: "I downloaded data from Beloit's docket system into my own docket system." However, Mr. Lowe does not provide a copy of the data downloaded from the Beloit docket system. In addition, Mr. Lowe's statement refers to his docket system, which alerted him to the thirty month deadline for entering the national stage, but which apparently did not "provide a specific indication of the necessity of entering the national phase in the United States." Some further explanation is required as to how Mr. Lowe's docketing system works, that is, how the system could alert him to the thirty month deadline for national stage entry but not alert him to the thirty month deadline for entry into the national stage in the United States. In addition, Mr. Lowe has attached as exhibit D to his statement a redacted letter to Greg Wedel of Beloit Technologies, Inc. in which Mr. Lowe asks for instructions regarding what countries to enter the national stage in. Applicants do not, however, provide a copy of the response received from Beloit Technologies in response to this inquiry. This response must be provided and must be accompanied by whatever further information applicants have with respect to the specific instructions provided by Beloit Technologies in response to the letter attached as Exhibit D.

Based on the above, applicants have not satisfied the final requirements for a grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b). Accordingly, the renewed petition is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper reply must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Second Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.137(b)." No additional petition fee is required.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Box PCT, Washington, D.C. 20231, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the PCT Legal Office



Leonard Smith
PCT Legal Examiner
PCT Legal Office

RMR/LS:rmr



Richard M. Ross
PCT Petitions Attorney
PCT Legal Office
Telephone: (703) 308-6155
Facsimile: (703) 308-6459